

Evaluation News is produced by BJA's Center for Program Evaluation at the Justice Research and Statistics Association.

Send questions and comments to
bjaeval@jrsa.org

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)
Center for Program Evaluation at the Justice Research and Statistics Association
777 N. Capitol St., NE, Suite 801
Washington, DC 20002
202 842-9330

To subscribe or unsubscribe to *Evaluation News*, send an email with your request to
bjaeval@jrsa.org

***Evaluation News* provides information on the BJA Center for Program Evaluation, promotes the exchange of information on evaluation and performance measurement, and publicizes criminal justice research and evaluation reports for use by state and local criminal justice agencies.**

LAW ENFORCEMENT

A report released this past spring by the Australian Institute of Criminology discussed the effectiveness of police-based drug diversion programs included in the Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI). IDDI programs use an individual's contact with the justice system to engage that person in drug education, assessment, and treatment. IDDI programs aim to reduce the level of contact that participants have with the criminal justice system. Results for IDDI reported in, "*Police Drug Diversion: A Study of Criminal Offending Outcomes*," were generally positive. Most referred to an IDDI program did not reoffend in the 12- to 18-month period following diversion, but there were clear differences in post-program recidivism across programs. The best predictors of reoffending across most jurisdictions were prior offending and program noncompliance. The report is available at: <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/rpp/97/>

"*Community Policing and Crime: The Process and Impact of Problem-Solving in Oakland*" published by RAND is an assessment of an Oakland, California, measure to reduce violence through community policing, violence prevention, and other programs. The report examines the effectiveness of a community-policing effort called the problem-solving officer (PSO) program. Data used to assess the program included: officer surveys, official data on officer deployment, official crime statistics, and semi-structured interviews and focus groups with police department staff. Overall, there was no evidence that the PSO program is associated with reductions in crime and violence. However, it is likely that implementation issues inhibited program success. For the report see: http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/2008/RAND_TR635.pdf

CRIME PREVENTION

The systematic review entitled, "*Effects of Closed Circuit Television Surveillance on Crime*," by Welsh and Farrington focuses on the effectiveness of using closed circuit television (CCTV) surveillance cameras for prevention of personal and property crime in a public space. A *systematic review* takes a rigorous approach to reviewing the results of many studies on a particular topic. In this review CCTV was shown to have a modest, but significant, desirable effect on crime. Use of CCTV is most effective in reducing crime in parking garages and is more effective in reducing crime in the United Kingdom than in other countries. For the report go to: http://db.c2admin.org/doc-pdf/Welsh_CCTV_review.pdf

A 2008 study by Ratcliffe and Taniguchi evaluated the crime reduction effect of CCTV cameras located on the street in various locations around Philadelphia. Overall, the use of cameras was associated with a 13% reduction in crime, but in many camera sites there

was noticeable crime impact. Further research is needed to explain variation in outcomes by camera location. The report, *"The Crime Reduction Effects of Public CCTV Cameras in the City of Philadelphia, PA Installed During 2006,"* is available at: <http://www.temple.edu/cj/misc/PhilaCCTV.pdf>

ADJUDICATION/ SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Carey et al. used the key components from the National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), a series of best practice benchmarks for drug courts, to understand variations in program operation and their relationship to outcomes. Even with the key components, they found that drug courts have a lot of discretion regarding court processes. Further, differences across drug courts are expected and should not be viewed as negative. The drug court model is flexible and model adaptation is encouraged to better meet the clientele needs. Several drug court practices showed strong relationships with the three outcomes examined: investment costs, graduation rate, and outcome costs related to criminal justice recidivism. The report, *"Exploring the Key Components of Drug Courts: A Comparative Study of 18 Adult Drug Courts on Practices, Outcomes and Costs,"* is available at http://npcresearch.com/Files/NIJ_Cross-site_Final_Report_0308.pdf

Using the Key Components of Drug Courts developed by NADCP, Mackin and colleagues examined the operation of the Cecil County (Maryland) Adult Drug Treatment Court (CCADTC). In the report, *"Cecil County Adult Drug Treatment Court (Circuit Court) Process Evaluation,"* they state that though CCADTC carries out many of the ten key components through its current policies and structure, several areas need program improvements. See http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/Cecil_County_Adult_Circuit_Process_0808.pdf for the report.

In another study of a drug court, Carey et al. examined the effects of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) in California before and after its implementation. They examined the varying effectiveness of the drug court model compared to other criminal justice-related models for treating substance abusing offenders. SACPA aimed to reduce incarceration rates and increase recovery from drug use for low-level, non-violent, drug-involved offenders. SACPA programs generally had limited criminal justice system involvement. SACPA was successful in reaching nearly all eligible offenders and offering substance abuse treatment rather than incarceration. Further, it allowed offenders to have more treatment than the Drug Court. However, the Drug Court had better program completion rates, lower recidivism, and less cost than the SACPA programs. *"Drug Courts and State-Mandated Drug Treatment Programs: Outcomes, Costs, and Consequences,"* is available at http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/Prop36_Drug_Court_Final_Report_0308.pdf

NEW CENTER OPENS TO PROMOTE RESEARCH-BASED CRIME POLICIES

This past summer, the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP) opened at George Mason University. CEBCP seeks to make scientific research a key component in decisions about crime and justice policies by advancing rigorous studies in criminal justice and criminology and serving as an informational link to practitioners and the policy community. For more information see the CEBCP web site: <http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/>

TIP OF THE MONTH

Planning to add a new performance measure for which many different people or agencies will be responsible? Before instituting the new measure, get their input on how to interpret elements of the measure. This will help prevent data aggregation problems. Concepts like *improved client functioning*, *successful program completion*, and *recidivism* require clear definitions to ensure everyone is able to and will calculate the concepts comparably.